

REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-9. Claims 1, 8 and 9 are amended herein. No new matter is presented.

Thus, claims 1-9 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS:

At item 3 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner indicates that figures 1-14 as filed do not show the claimed invention.

The claimed invention including disclosure items correspondingly assigned by users and transmission of information corresponding to the disclosure items in response to execution of an information disclosure procedure assigned to the information is described at least in FIGS. 6-8, 11 and 13. For example, as illustrated in FIG. 6, a information disclosure procedure table is prepared for each disclosure level of each individual where the information disclosure procedure table is registered with a disclosure level, disclosure items, etc., (see also, page 15, first paragraph). As further illustrated in FIGS. 7 and 8, normal-time and emergency-time authentication tables are prepared for each individual to enable different authentication procedures based on the current situation.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that figures 1-14 as filed support the invention claimed in claims 1-9.

Therefore, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTION:

At item 4 of the outstanding Office Action, claim 9 was objected to due to informalities. Claim 9 is amended herein.

Therefore, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112¶2:

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112¶2 for being indefinite. Claim 9 is amended herein.

Therefore, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of the following: U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0177030 (Turner), U.S. Patent No. 6,302,844 (Walker), U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0083192 (Alisuag), U.S. Patent No. 6,539,101 (Black) and U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0029157 (Marchosky).

The Examiner relies on Turner as teaching both the information disclosure items and the information disclosure procedure of the present invention. However, Turner is directed to assigning individuals to predefined security levels for determining whether access to a patient's information should be granted, and if so, the amount of access to be granted (see, paragraphs 22, 25 and 26). That is, Turner is limited to providing access to the patient's information based on the requester's membership to one of the predefined security levels.

Further, Walker is directed to a preference ranking of experts according to which a request for diagnosis is transmitted such that the patient's data is provided to selected experts (see, FIG. 8A and corresponding text), and Black is limited to biometric technology based identity verification offered by different locations (see, col. 4, lines 50-58 and col. 8, lines 31-40).

The Examiner also relies on Alisuag as teaching the information disclosure procedure provided by each user. However, Alisuag is limited to using a passcode of a person for accessing the person's records when the person is conscious and using identifying information of the person if the person is unconscious and does not allow the person to define a desired disclosure procedure (see, paragraph 12).

The Examiner acknowledges that Turner, Walker and Alisuag do not mention that disclosure items and procedures are assigned by each individual, but relies on Marchosky as teaching the same. However, the individual patients in Marchosky are limited to entering information in their record and granting/denying authorization to others (see, Abstract and paragraph 22). In Marchosky, a central computer (102) executes a security program (114) to limit access to the medical and biographical database (106) and individual medical and biographical records (112) contained therein to health care providers that are authorized by a patient to access the particular patient's medical and biographical record (112) (see, paragraphs 36, 42 and 73). That is, Marchosky is limited to denying or granting authorization to the patients' records (i.e., the individual patients are not able to define a disclosure procedure to be performed when accessing the information).

In contrast to the above-discussed references, the present invention allows a user to define a disclosure procedure necessary to access each item of information and executes the disclosure procedure to enable other users to access the information only when the users have entered the disclosure procedure. For example, a user is able to define a password as the disclosure procedure needed to access the user's address and define a fingerprint as the disclosure procedure needed to access the user's phone number, and the system only discloses the user's phone number and address when the password and the fingerprint is entered, respectively.

Independent claim 1 recites, "an individual information storing section in which corresponding individual information and corresponding information disclosure items of each individual is registered", where "the information disclosure items being assigned in accordance with a selection by a corresponding individual." Claim 1 further recites, "a disclosure procedure storing section in which an information disclosure procedure assigned to each individual by each individual is registered", where the information disclosure procedure is "defined by each individual." As such the individual information corresponding to the information disclosure items of the specific individual is transmitted when the information disclosure procedure "defined by each individual" is satisfied.

Independent claim 8 recites, "information disclosure items correspondingly assigned in accordance with a selection by the users" and "allowing each of the users to define an information disclosure procedure necessary to access respective information of each of the users" such that information corresponding to the information disclosure items is provided responsive to "an input of an information disclosure procedure matching the assigned information disclosure procedure corresponding to the specific user."

Independent claim 9 recites, "allowing the first user to define a corresponding disclosure procedure based on a selection of the corresponding disclosure procedure by the first user" and "executing a corresponding disclosure procedure assigned to an item of the information upon receipt of a request from a second user that satisfies the corresponding disclosure procedure assigned to the item by the first user."

The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claims 1, 8 and 9 including an information disclosure procedure "defined" by each user.

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over the cited references.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claim 7, "the disclosure procedure storing section is freely registered with an authorized person having a right of proceeding with an information disclosure procedure on behalf of the specific individual" such that disclosure procedure of the specific individual "matching an information disclosure procedure of the authorized person" is executed "as a procedure for disclosing the corresponding individual information of the specific individual."

The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest "disclosure procedure storing section freely registered with an authorized person having a right of proceeding with an information disclosure procedure on behalf of the specific individual", as recited in claim 7.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENT:

Applicants respectfully request entry of amendments to the claims because the amendments thereto were made to clarify the recited features and do not introduce significant changes that would require a further search.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 03/24/2006
1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

By: Temnit Afework
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202